

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

MANUEL RAMIREZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF WASHINGTON and DOE,

Defendants.

NO: 4:14-CV-5123-RMP

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
TRANSFER ACTION

BEFORE THE COURT is Plaintiff's letter dated May 27, 2015, in which he requests a "change of venue" to the U.S. District Court in Seattle, Washington.

Due to Plaintiff's *pro se* status, the Court liberally construes this letter as a motion to transfer this action to the Western District of Washington pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a), ECF No. 11. It was noted for hearing without oral argument.

Plaintiff initiated this action while housed at the Washington State Penitentiary. His complaint did not contain a short and plain statement of his claim showing that he was entitled to relief. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8 (a). By Order filed

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO TRANSFER ACTION --1

1 April 23, 2015, the Court instructed Plaintiff to amend or voluntarily dismiss
2 within sixty (60) days, and provided him with a civil rights complaint form on
3 which to present an amended complaint. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff has not yet
4 submitted a First Amended Complaint on that form.

5 On June 1, 2015, the Court received Plaintiff's correspondence regarding
6 this case in an envelope with the return address of Clallam Bay Corrections Center.
7 Plaintiff is once more advised that it is his responsibility to keep the Court
8 informed of his change of address. Based on his *pro se* status, the Court has
9 liberally construed Plaintiff's submission as a Notice of Change of Address. *See*
10 ECF No. 12.

11 It is unclear from Plaintiff's submissions in cause number 4:14-cv-5123-
12 RMP why venue for this complaint would be appropriate in the Western District of
13 Washington. The only named Defendants were State of Washington and Doe.
14 Plaintiff did not clearly articulate any claims or state where they occurred. At this
15 time, the Court has insufficient information to determine that venue is improper

16 //

17 //

18 //

19 //

20 //

1 under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), and therefore, cannot find that it would be “in the
2 interest of justice,” to transfer this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

3 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion, **ECF**
4 **No. 11**, is **DENIED**.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The District Court Clerk is directed to enter this
6 Order and forward a copy to Plaintiff at his last known address.

7 **DATED** this 2nd day of June 2015.

8
9 *s/ Rosanna Malouf Peterson*
10 ROSANNA MALOUF PETERSON
11 Chief United States District Court Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20